

20061128.ba v03\_n978.bam.20061128

>From ???@??? Tue Nov 28 16:46:13 2006 -0600  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 22:45:02 GMT  
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 3978  
Message-Id: <20061128224504.B0BF4187A80@srvr1.theporch.com>

BOATANCHORS Digest 3978

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by Charles <charlesmorris@hughes.net>
- 2) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>
- 3) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
- 4) Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 5) WTB National Tube Shields and Bases  
by "Freeberg, Scott \ (STP\)" <Scott.Freeberg@guidant.com>
- 6) Re: [ARC5] Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
by jcoward5452@aol.com
- 7) Re: [ARC5] Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
by wb3fau@att.net
- 8) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by Robert Nickels <W9RAN@oneradio.net>
- 9) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by Garey Barrell <k4oah@mindspring.com>
- 10) Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 11) Re: [ARC5] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
by jcoward5452@aol.com
- 12) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
- 13) Re: St. Roch Radio Room  
by stuck in 50s <polepeeg@aa4rm.ba-watch.org>
- 14) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by stuck in 50s <polepeeg@aa4rm.ba-watch.org>
- 15) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
- 16) Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 17) Re: [Milsurplus] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
by "William Donzelli" <wdonzelli@gmail.com>
- 18) Re: St. Roch Radio Room

by w8au@sssnet.com

19) Free to a good home - lots of milsurplus parts.

by Tom Norris <r390a@bellsouth.net>

20) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?

by Steve Berg <wa9jml@tbc.net>

21) Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?

by john <johnmb@nc.rr.com>

---

From: Charles <charlesmorris@hughes.net>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Date: Sun, 26 Nov 2006 18:45:15 -0500  
Message-ID: <ri8km2h7pvmqoi2f8fqbvhd3oa2g6mbhg@4ax.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I still can't get the HW-32 sweep tube finals to stabilize. On closer inspection the two series 22 pf caps (one arm of the neutralizing bridge) had been replaced with 10 pf caps. I put them back to 22 pf with no improvement. The finals still want to oscillate by themselves at frequencies from approximately 13.8 to 14.5 MHz and that only roughly corresponds to the position of the main tuning cap.

It doesn't matter whether they are connected to the antenna or a 51 ohm carbon resistor. At the extremes of the tuning cap setting it sits quietly but somewhere in the middle as it is tuned, they vigorously break into oscillations.

I've tried additional screen bypass caps directly to the chassis, lowering the grid swamping resistor from 6800 ohms to 2700, trying different values of silver-mica caps for the other bridge arm (1300 pf) and even replacing the 11 pf bridge arm with a 3-60 pf air variable. The tendency to oscillation can be reduced but not eliminated by adjusting the bridge cap somewhere in its center of range.

This really frustrates me since I thought once the bridge was balanced, the amplifier should be neutralized over a broad range of frequencies (certainly including 14.200-14.350 MHz!)

Heath's screen and cathode bypassing arrangement seems rather complicated to me, with some of the caps in series. I also am not crazy about the number of unshielded areas on the PC board. Should it perhaps be simplified and just ground each cap with the shortest possible leads, or to a short wide extension of copper strap screwed to the chassis?

Also, I'm trying to find a copy of this very relevant service bulletin:

```
>                September 29, 1982
>HW-32                Bulletin No:
>20 Meter SSB Transceiver          HW-32-2
>
>                Finals Self-Oscillate
>
>+ + + + Information not available at this time + + + +
```

but "Not Available" is all that comes up! It figures...  
Any thoughts from the amp gurus?

thanks  
Charles  
(Single banding on 75 and 40 :)

-----  
Message-ID: <004e01c711c6\$8ca8ad90\$660fa8c0@radiatoroom>  
From: "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Date: Sun, 26 Nov 2006 20:51:14 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 format=flowed;  
 charset="iso-8859-1";  
 reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
>I still can't get the HW-32 sweep tube finals to stabilize.
>On closer
> inspection the two series 22 pf caps (one arm of the
> neutralizing
> bridge) had been replaced with 10 pf caps. I put them back
> to 22 pf
> with no improvement. The finals still want to oscillate by
> themselves
> at frequencies from approximately 13.8 to 14.5 MHz and
> that only
> roughly corresponds to the position of the main tuning
> cap.
```

What you will have to do is disable the positive voltages on the PA tubes (screen grid and anode) and drive the PA tubes while peaking the output circuit on an external meter or

scope. Then you can select feedback capacitance that nulls the feedthrough power.

- > It doesn't matter whether they are connected to the
- > antenna or a 51
- > ohm carbon resistor. At the extremes of the tuning cap
- > setting it sits
- > quietly but somewhere in the middle as it is tuned, they
- > vigorously
- > break into oscillations.

Of course the load largely doesn't matter. The pi-net will rotate the phase angle and impedance seen by the anode all over the place regardless of load impedance.

Are you sure this is a real near-operating-frequency oscillation? Sometimes it can be a low frequency oscillation that mixes up to the operating frequency. There would be several distinct cures depending on the actual oscillating frequency. If it is near the operating frequency it requires neutralization or swamping of the grid or a combination of the two. This assumes the screen ps properly bypassed and nothing else is wrong. This also assumes the PA stage is oscillating, and not an earlier stage.

- > This really frustrates me since I thought once the bridge
- > was
- > balanced, the amplifier should be neutralized over a broad
- > range of
- > frequencies (certainly including 14.200-14.350 MHz!)

You can measure it pretty easy. Just disable the PA and drive it and check the feedthrough power.

- > Heath's screen and cathode bypassing arrangement seems
- > rather
- > complicated to me, with some of the caps in series. I also
- > am not
- > crazy about the number of unshielded areas on the PC
- > board. Should it
- > perhaps be simplified and just ground each cap with the
- > shortest
- > possible leads, or to a short wide extension of copper
- > strap screwed
- > to the chassis?

Flashing or smooth wide foil has less impedance than braiding, not that it matters much if the lead is short. I'd

disable the PA voltages and make some actual feedthrough measurements.

73 Tom

-----  
Message-ID: <000701c71218\$67ea1e60\$6be47443@KB6NAX>  
From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 03:37:13 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> I still can't get the HW-32 sweep tube finals to stabilize.

Welcome to sweep tube mania, Charles.

Sweep tubes were never intended to be RF power amplifiers. They were designed to run at TV horizontal frequencies, just a few orders of magnitude lower in frequency than the 20 meter band. Their interelectrode capacitance vary widely, their lead inductance vary substantially, and the killer is their transconductances at RF frequencies are anybody's guess.

You can have the final perfectly neutralized but if the transconductance is high enough feedback external to the tube's internal feedback paths can result in instability. I suspect that may be your problem.

I once tried several different manufacturers' tubes in a Swan 500. Each had different sorts of stability problems. None were worth a damn as the 500 was a reasonably good design. I wish the power race in consumer grade ham gear had confined itself to 6146's and such instead of TV junk.

That's my two corroded pennies worth.

Arden Allen  
KB6NAX

-----  
Message-ID: <003701c7122b\$c043a1e0\$fa01fea9@262ul>  
From: "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 07:55:43 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Seeking GF/RU dynamotor, transmitter control box,  
receiver/transmitter coil sets and junction box  
with \*green\* nomenclature tags.  
Thanks.

-----  
Content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Subject: WTB National Tube Shields and Bases  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 09:55:55 -0600  
Message-ID: <159D9606C7F1304C8059DAEB6B2ED8BE8BB665@STPEVS01.stp.guidant.com>  
From: "Freeberg, Scott \ (STP\)" <Scott.Freeberg@guidant.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

I am still looking to buy some National Tube shields with bases. These =  
are the styles used with the National SW-5, SW-3, FB-7, early HRO, etc. =  
Some, like the SW-5, are simply cans with a lid and base, others have =  
the 'lighthouse' cap on the top. I've got two receiver projects that =  
I'd like to duplicate the original articles. I've been looking for a =  
year with little luck; the bases are the hard part. Do you have a few =  
that you can spare for a homebrew receiver project?  
Thanks. 73, Scott WA9WFA

-----  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Subject: Re: [ARC5] Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 13:14:53 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
From: jcoward5452@aol.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  
Message-Id: <8C8E0671222BF2B-B90-8A9E@mb1k-d26.sysops.aol.com>

Dave,  
What is the significance of Green tags? I've only seen Black and Blue.  
Thanks,  
Jay

-----Original Message-----  
From: arc5@ix.netcom.com  
To: boatanchors@theporch.com; milsurplus@mailman.qth.net;  
ARC5@mailman.qth.net

Sent: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 5:55 AM  
Subject: [ARC5] Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff

Seeking GF/RU dynamotor, transmitter control box,  
receiver/transmitter coil sets and junction box  
with \*green\* nomenclature tags.  
Thanks.

---

ARC5 mailing list  
ARC5@mailman.qth.net  
<http://mailman.qth.net/mailman/listinfo/arc5>

---

Check out the new AOL. Most comprehensive set of free safety and  
security tools, free access to millions of high-quality videos from  
across the web, free AOL Mail and more.

---

From: wb3fau@att.net  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: [ARC5] Wanted: Green Tagged GF/RU Stuff  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 20:33:01 +0000  
Message-Id:  
<112720062033.21054.456B4B7D00004D8160000523E21604666489A0E00CC0D99@att.net>

try Fair Radio Sales

---

Message-ID: <456BAC22.4010200@oneradio.net>  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 21:25:22 -0600  
From: Robert Nickels <W9RAN@oneradio.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
CC: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Arden Allen wrote:

> I wish the power race in consumer grade ham  
> gear had confined itself to 6146's and such instead of TV junk.  
>

I've had the same thoughts, Arden - especially after fighting  
neutralization problems. Your comment got me to wondering "So who  
started it?" I was thinking of the Galaxy, Drake, and Swan gear that  
all used sweep tube finals but glancing over the sweep tube section of  
Lud Sibleys "Tube Lore" shows that we'd have to go back to the AM days

to fix blame. Heck, I should have remembered my HT-40 novice transmitter used a 6DQ5 final, as did several other rigs, and another early TV sweep tube, the 6DQ6 found its way into a host of rigs including the DX-20, T-60, and the "King of all Chirp" Conar 400. These may not be the first but I see enough to convince me it was manufacturers trying to hold cost down for entry-level Novice transmitters that started this trend. The sideband transceiver guys just followed suit.

It's probably a shorter list to ask "Which sideband rigs did NOT use sweep tubes"!

73 Bob W9RAN

-----  
Message-ID: <456BB25A.7080803@mindspring.com>  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 22:51:54 -0500  
From: Garey Barrell <k4oah@mindspring.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Robert Nickels wrote:

> Arden Allen wrote:

>> I wish the power race in consumer grade ham

>> gear had confined itself to 6146's and such instead of TV junk.

>>

>

> I've had the same thoughts, Arden - especially after fighting  
> neutralization problems. Your comment got me to wondering "So who  
> started it?" I was thinking of the Galaxy, Drake, and Swan gear that  
> all used sweep tube finals but glancing over the sweep tube section of  
> Lud Sibleys "Tube Lore" shows that we'd have to go back to the AM days  
> to fix blame. Heck, I should have remembered my HT-40 novice  
> transmitter used a 6DQ5 final, as did several other rigs, and another  
> early TV sweep tube, the 6DQ6 found its way into a host of rigs  
> including the DX-20, T-60, and the "King of all Chirp" Conar 400.  
> These may not be the first but I see enough to convince me it was  
> manufacturers trying to hold cost down for entry-level Novice  
> transmitters that started this trend. The sideband transceiver guys  
> just followed suit.  
> It's probably a shorter list to ask "Which sideband rigs did NOT use  
> sweep tubes"!

>



> 73 Bob W9RAN

>

Bob -

I don't disagree that it was a cost cutting move, but there was considerably more than just the tube cost involved. For example, the 6JB6 cost \$1.63 at "Amateur Net" in 1965 when Drake started using them. The 6146 was \$4.25. Drake probably paid less than \$ .50 for them. They used Sylvania tubes because Sylvania was the only manufacturer who published Class AB1 RF specs for them. So the cost differential of two tubes for a \$400 transmitter wasn't all that great. Plus they work fine and give reasonable life, assuming you know to keep the plate dipped... Quickly! All that perveance makes for LOTS of plate current off resonance.

But the real cost savings were in the power supply. The T-4X series runs 650 VDC, within the ratings of the 700V DCWV ratings of electrolytic caps available at the time. At that voltage they were able to get 130W of carrier output, while the S-Line was doing good to get 110W out of their 6146s with 800V on the plates, and only claimed 100W. There was a "horsepower" (Watts) race going on, so that extra 20-30% power difference along with reduced power supply cost looked pretty good to the ad department and bean counters.

I don't think Swan could have built their 500W transceiver, or Galaxy their 2000W linear amp in less than a cubic foot with 6146's! The Galaxy had ten (10) sweep tubes in there, all in parallel, working up through 10M.

73, Garey - K40AH  
Atlanta

Drake 2-B, 4-B & C-Line Service Supplement CDs  
<[www.k4oah.com](http://www.k4oah.com)>

-----  
Message-ID: <004f01c712a4\$a199dba0\$fa01fea9@262ul>

From: "David Stinson" <[arc5@ix.netcom.com](mailto:arc5@ix.netcom.com)>

To: Old Tube Radios <[boatanchors@theporch.com](mailto:boatanchors@theporch.com)>

Subject: Re: Green Tagged GF/RU

Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 22:21:08 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

(Jay wrote:

>" So far, no response as to the significance of green tags."

Been digging out my documents. Takes some time.

Still missing one contract number for my reply,  
but what the heck- will go ahead without it.

Several of our members have asked about  
the green tags on GF/RU equipment.

The green tags signify sets purchased for Naval Reserve units.  
GF-6/RU-8 (N0s-59345, 1938), GF-7/RU-9 (contract ?, 1938)  
and GF-10/RU-15 (N0s-1939) were all for Naval Reserve aircraft.  
I have most of the GF-10/RU-15 set and the manual for GF-6/RU-8.  
Both are 12 VDC. I don't have any information on the A+ voltage  
for the GF-7/RU-9; it is possible it was a 24 VDC set.

Someone asked about Marine Corps use of the GF/RU.  
According to SHIPS 242A, the most commonly found  
GF-11/RU-16 (N0s-84531, 1941)  
was purchased for shipboard Marine Corps use.  
It has a black tag.

Will Donzelli reports there is some possibility of a red-tagged  
GF/RU, but I have no other information. I would be grateful  
to see it if anyone knows of such a set.

73 Dave S.

-----  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Subject: Re: [ARC5] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 23:40:14 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
From: jcoward5452@aol.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  
Message-Id: <8C8E0BE6E0ACE76-B90-AEB4@mb1k-d26.sysops.aol.com>

Thanks Dave,  
My comments were "tongue firmly in cheek" for the most part. But the  
topic needs some expansion. Was (and is ) there any significance to tag  
color, beyond the Blue/Black for supply voltage differentiation, Red for  
H.V.?( and now some other purpose re Donzelli). Your Green now signifies  
"Naval Reserve", but why? Were these "seconds" off the assembly line and  
not up to the Navy specs? Or just older contracts slated for training  
and reserve units? It would make some sort of sense as new contracts  
were let that uncompleted contracts were allowed to run out but  
delivered to training units. The only manufacturing change would be the  
paint color of the nomenclature tags. Minimal cost.

Inquireing minds etc., etc.

Jay

-----Original Message-----

From: arc5@ix.netcom.com  
To: boatanchors@theporch.com; milsurplus@mailman.qth.net;  
ARC5@mailman.qth.net  
Sent: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 8:21 PM  
Subject: [ARC5] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU

(Jay wrote:

>" So far, no response as to the significance of green tags."  
Been digging out my documents. Takes some time.  
Still missing one contract number for my reply,  
but what the heck- will go ahead without it.

Several of our members have asked about  
the green tags on GF/RU equipment.

The green tags signify sets purchased for Naval Reserve units.  
GF-6/RU-8 (N0s-59345, 1938), GF-7/RU-9 (contract ?, 1938)  
and GF-10/RU-15 (N0s-1939) were all for Naval Reserve aircraft.  
I have most of the GF-10/RU-15 set and the manual for GF-6/RU-8.  
Both are 12 VDC. I don't have any information on the A+ voltage  
for the GF-7/RU-9; it is possible it was a 24 VDC set.

Someone asked about Marine Corps use of the GF/RU.  
According to SHIPS 242A, the most commonly found  
GF-11/RU-16 (N0s-84531, 1941)  
was purchased for shipboard Marine Corps use.  
It has a black tag.

Will Donzelli reports there is some possibility of a red-tagged  
GF/RU, but I have no other information. I would be grateful  
to see it if anyone knows of such a set.

73 Dave S.

---

ARC5 mailing list  
ARC5@mailman.qth.net  
<http://mailman.qth.net/mailman/listinfo/arc5>

---

Check out the new AOL. Most comprehensive set of free safety and  
security tools, free access to millions of high-quality videos from  
across the web, free AOL Mail and more.

---

Message-ID: <009401c712ac\$f3974340\$5fe47443@KB6NAX>  
From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Date: Mon, 27 Nov 2006 21:17:20 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> I don't disagree that it was a cost cutting move, .....

Well, Gary, if you'll pardon the cliches, some go for the gold, some go for the glitter, and the rest go home and build their own! ;-)

Arden Allen  
KB6NAX

-----  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 01:50:06 -0500 (EST)  
From: stuck in 50s <polepeeg@aa4rm.ba-watch.org>  
Message-Id: <200611280650.kAS6o6Wl010132@fracas.netboobie.org>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: St. Roch Radio Room

>record player in radio room, c'mon

that's a morse practice record. 40-80wpm.

Use quicktime pan to read the label

-----  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 02:01:53 -0500 (EST)  
From: stuck in 50s <polepeeg@aa4rm.ba-watch.org>  
Message-Id: <200611280701.kAS71rXQ010235@fracas.netboobie.org>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?

> Heath's screen and cathode bypassing arrangement seems rather  
> complicated to me, with some of the caps in series.

This might not be applicable BUT. But Galaxy used the ground lugs on their final's tube socket retaining rings. Same rings were riveted to chassis.

Used big iron to solder to chassis & all was well in 2 cases.

Marty

-----

Message-ID: <000f01c712e7\$d47fd040\$82e47443@KB6NAX>  
From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 04:22:04 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> This might not be applicable BUT. But Galaxy used the ground lugs  
> on their final's tube socket retaining rings. Same rings were  
> riveted to chassis.

Marty, this reminds me of both my Galaxy 5 and Swan 500 (it went down the road). The Galaxy was better behaved, nary a squabble with GE 6HF5's. It also reminds me of the unfinished DX-40 I rescued from fleas. Although it seemed sensible for Heath to run copper bus wire between tube socket saddle ground lugs I thought it was better to just do a good job of grounding to the aluminum chassis. So leaving out the bus wire I used internal tooth lockwashers every where and the rig was as docile as a newly built kitten (with no neutralization and low impedance grid drive, Tom ;-). And my 6146 I plugged in worked just like the others!

Arden Allen  
KB6NAX

-----  
Message-ID: <00a401c712ec\$f5b4d800\$fa01fea9@262ul>  
From: "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 06:58:53 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----  
From: <jcward5452@aol.com>  
Subject: [Milsurplus] Re: [ARC5] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU

> Thanks Dave,  
> ....Your Green now signifies  
> "Naval Reserve", but why?...

The Naval Reserve sets are speced for a different ranges of frequencies and used differing coil sets. For example: The 1938 GF-6 transmitter covered only 2000-4525 KC, while the "regular" 1938 Navy GF-5 set had coils covering 3000-9050 KC. But then, the GF-7, also a Reserve set," had the same coils as the GF-5 with the addition of a coil for 2000-3000KC. The later RU-15 Reserve receiver had only one single-range coil, and that for 1000-2000 KC, with dual coils to cover up to 9050 KC.

I'm sure the justification was "frequency management between the services," and that would require keeping sets together with their speced coils, but I think that' was the "on top" reason. While I can't prove it, I suspect the utterly unjustified and unfair attitude that Guard and Reserve units somehow aren't "real military" (which still persists today and is still unjustified) had something to do with ordering sets designed to keep "them" on "their" frequencies. Last I looked, Guard and Reserve men and women bleed red blood, just like "regular army."

73 Dave S.

-----  
Message-ID: <e1d20d630611280715j3a384787m9d3627aa53f72432@mail.gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 10:15:18 -0500  
From: "William Donzelli" <wdonzelli@gmail.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: [Milsurplus] Re: Green Tagged GF/RU  
Cc: boatanchors@theporch.com, milsurplus@mailman.qth.net  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

> I'm sure the justification was "frequency management between  
> the services," and that would require keeping sets together  
> with their speced coils, but I think that' was the "on top" reason.  
> While I can't prove it, I suspect the utterly unjustified and unfair  
> attitude that Guard and Reserve units somehow aren't "real military"  
> (which still persists today and is still unjustified)  
> had something to do with ordering sets designed to keep "them"  
> on "their" frequencies. Last I looked, Guard and Reserve men  
> and women bleed red blood, just like "regular army."

Perhaps, but the "on top" reason of frequency management is quite valid for the era as well. The Signal Corps took the concept to relatively stupid levels in the 1930s, issuing a bunch of sets that could not talk to each other.

--  
Will

-----  
Message-Id: <7.0.1.0.0.20061128102904.02f082d0@sssnnet.com>  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 10:39:37 -0500  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: w8au@sssnnet.com  
Subject: Re: St. Roch Radio Room  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 01:50 AM 11/28/06, stuck in 50s wrote:  
> >record player in radio room, c'mon  
>  
>that's a morse practice record. 40-80wpm.  
>  
>Use quicktime pan to read the label

Didn't have enough TFC to keep him busy? :-)  
Whatever reason, it's in the way. And, hey...  
No Mill to copy tfc on? Hmmm.

w8au

-----  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.2)  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Message-Id: <945DD6D6-2DA3-4B5C-BFCF-CFB2ADCCCC12@bellsouth.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: Tom Norris <r390a@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: Free to a good home - lots of milsurplus parts.  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 12:53:10 -0600

Got a lot of boat anchor parts a couple years back from an estate, and have made my money back off the lot. About a third of what I had is left, and a lot of it is still nice stuff. All military surplus 1940s through 1960s vintage boat anchor parts, transformers, chokes, caps, lots of Navy "anchor" marked stuff, high voltage, stuff that is rarely seen anymore. I have yet to get a complaint from anyone at a hamfest saying the stuff they got from me didn't work, so most of this stuff is good.  
Not mine, but posted here with the blessing of the one giving it away. Good stuff for homebrew projects. The CATCH is you have to

haul it \*all\* away in one lot.

Contact him directly -- mike\_davidsen@yahoo.com

73

Tom NU4G

-----  
from mike\_davidsen@yahoo.com

I don't have time to go to hamfests selling this stuff anymore, so I want to find a couple people to come and take what they want for free (there are hundred of parts left), as long as they promise to give a good home and not scrap the parts out. These are choice parts, and have been saved for many years in good storage, so they're worth more than scrap to us. I live in Northern VA, and will only provide for you to pick up in person. I can ship all of them at once, but suffice to say about 1 ton of parts on a pallet is going to cost a bit to ship.

Email me if interested in coming and taking a look.

Mike  
KI4JSC

-----  
Message-ID: <456CB8FA.70908@tbc.net>  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 16:32:26 -0600  
From: Steve Berg <wa9jml@tbc.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I do not think it was strictly a cost concern. Some of these tubes actually work quite well. Gonset was partial to the 6DQ5 as a final amplifier tube. There is one in the GSB-100 and it is also the final in the G-76. I finally had to replace the final in my GSB-100 and I suspect that it was the original tube for the rig. It lasted for at least 30 years. It provides decent power and takes minimal space. Works fine up through 10 meters. In the G-76 I was always told to get a RCA tube with the getter on the side. In my rig, a Westinghouse tube barely worked at 15 meters, but the RCA would work fine at 6 meters and seems to last quite a while, even with heavy use. The 6DQ5 was not designed for this sort of use, but seems to do quite well in it.



I have a National NCX-5 transceiver which has given great service to me for about 20 years. In that time, I have had to replace the finals twice, with plenty of use. If I tuned it up quickly, they last just fine. Like the GSB-200, I get great reports and neutralization is not all that difficult. Sweep tubes, properly used, do a credible job in our ham equipment.

73,

Steve WA9JML

-----  
Message-Id: <6.2.1.2.2.20061128174324.035cbe60@pop-server.nc.rr.com>  
Date: Tue, 28 Nov 2006 17:45:08 -0500  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: john <johnmb@nc.rr.com>  
Subject: Re: HW-32 final neutralizing?  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I'll second that...I had a G76 as a retread novice in the early 70s, and it's 'DQ5 worked well, with lot's of abuse and poorly matched antennas. I never changed PA tubes and they were still going as new when I swapped off the rig.

John K5MO

At 05:32 PM 11/28/2006, Steve Berg wrote:

>I do not think it was strictly a cost concern. Some of these tubes  
>actually work quite well. Gonset was partial to the 6DQ5 as a final  
>amplifier tube. There is one in the GSB-100 and it is also the final in  
>the G-76. I finally had to replace the final in my GSB-100 and I suspect  
>that it was the original tube for the rig. It lasted for at least 30  
>years. It provides decent power and takes minimal space. Works fine up  
>through 10 meters. In the G-76 I was always told to get a RCA tube with  
>the getter on the side. In my rig, a Westinghouse tube barely worked at  
>15 meters, but the RCA would work fine at 6 meters and seems to last quite  
>a while, even with heavy use. The 6DQ5 was not designed for this sort of  
>use, but seems to do quite well in it.

>

>I have a National NCX-5 transceiver which has given great service to me  
>for about 20 years. In that time, I have had to replace the finals twice,  
>with plenty of use. If I tuned it up quickly, they last just fine. Like  
>the GSB-200, I get great reports and neutralization is not all that  
>difficult. Sweep tubes, properly used, do a credible job in our ham equipment.

>

>73,  
>  
>Steve WA9JML  
>  
>  
>--  
>Internal Virus Database is out-of-date.  
>Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
>Version: 7.1.405 / Virus Database: 268.14.7/537 - Release Date: 11/17/2006

--  
Internal Virus Database is out-of-date.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.1.405 / Virus Database: 268.14.7/537 - Release Date: 11/17/2006

-----  
End of BOATANCHORS Digest 3978  
\*\*\*\*\*